

**PATENT**

**IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE**

In re the Application of

Kuzemchak et al. (TI-32443)

Conf. No. 6142

Serial No. 10/017,777

Group Art Unit: 2192

Filed: December 13, 2001

Examiner: Vo

For: Method and Tool for Verification of Algorithms Ported From One Instruction Set  
Architecture to Another

**TRANSMITTAL OF SECOND SUBSTITUTE APPELLANTS' BRIEF**

Commissioner for Patents  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Dear Sir:

Appellants respectfully present their brief in support of their appeal of the final rejection of claims in this case. The Notice of Appeal was filed on August 3, 2005, as indicated on the date of the automated facsimile receipt from the Patent and Trademark Office. This Substitute Appellant's Brief is presented in response to the Notice of Non-Compliant Appeal Brief mailed August 1, 2006.

This Second Substitute Appellants' Brief is now the third brief filed in this appeal. The undersigned has endeavored, in this Second Substitute Appellants' Brief, to address the grounds raised by the Examiner in finding the Substitute Appellants' Brief filed on May 5, 2006 to be defective.

To be perfectly candid, however, the preparation of this Second Substitute Appellants' Brief was, to a large extent, a "guessing game". It is unclear, from the Notice of Non-Compliant Appeal Brief, just what it was that was defective about the Substitute Appellants' Brief filed on May 5. And while the undersigned appreciates the time granted by the Examiner for a telephone call earlier this week, few if any specifics about what exactly was defective came out of that conversation.

Appellants submit that this Second Substitute Appellants' Brief meets the requirements of the Rules of Practice. Should the Examiner again find a discrepancy between this Brief and the Rules of Practice, the undersigned would appreciate a telephone call from the Examiner to discuss the *specific reasons why this Brief might be defective*, so that the undersigned can perhaps convince the Examiner that the Brief is not defective, or so that the undersigned can at least address the specific deficiencies.

In any event, Appellants' look forward to the eventual submitting of this case to the Board for consideration of their appeal.

Respectfully submitted,

/rma/

Rodney M. Anderson  
Registry No. 31,939  
Attorney for Appellants

Anderson, Levine & Lintel, L.L.P.  
14785 Preston Road, Suite 650  
Dallas, Texas 75254  
(972) 664-9554